

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 941

EC 182 942

AUTHOR Brulle, Andrew R.; And Others
TITLE Project I.D.: A Study of Services for Students Labeled as Learning Disabled. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Eastern Illinois Univ., Charleston. Dept. of Special Education.
PUB DATE 30 Apr 86
NOTE 59p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Delivery Systems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Handicap Identification; *Learning Disabilities; Services; *Special Education; *State Standards; Student Characteristics; *Student Evaluation; *Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS Illinois

ABSTRACT

The study examined the characteristics of children currently classified as learning disabled (LD) in Illinois. Student and teacher checklists were completed and records reviewed for 1349 students (ages 5-20). Results are depicted in table form and summarized according to five major objectives: (1) to determine types of regular education remedial services available to LD students (speech therapy was the most frequently provided special service); (2) to determine selection procedures of LD students (the most common reason for referral was academic difficulties); (3) to determine the percentage of time per day that LD students received special services (the majority were served through resource programs with an average of nearly 6 hours per week); (4) to determine areas of emphasis in LD programs (the goals established were primarily academic in nature); and (5) to determine if there are demographic or other variables associated with the identification process (there was no discernable pattern in the procedures used by districts to classify children as LD). Findings suggested the need for the state to take action to bring consistency to the classification and service provision process. Three options are offered for consideration: (1) to allow all theories a fair test on the premise that one would eventually win out; (2) to adopt the state's own classification criteria; or (3) to provide services solely on the basis of demonstrated need regardless of arbitrary classification. References and checklists are appended. (CL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

ED270941

FINAL REPORT
Project I. D.
A Study of Services for Students
Labeled as Learning Disabled

Andrew R. Brulle, Project Director
Michelle M. Dawson, Assistant Director

Marsha Guernsey, Data Collector
Judith Ivarie, Data Collector
Majorie Peary, Data Collector

Department of Special Education
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois 61920

April 30, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Andrew R.
Brulle

EC182942

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Method	4
Objectives and Data Collection	4
Analysis	5
Results	7
Student Variables	7
Teacher Variables	37
Summary of Results by Objective	40
Discussion	44
References	48
Appendix 1	50

Introduction

A major concern in the field of special education today is the increase in the number of individuals in the school-age population who have been identified as learning disabled (LD). For example, Tucker (1980) reported that in one state the percent of children identified as learning disabled increased from less than two percent in 1970 to nearly 44 percent in 1977. Similarly, the U. S. Office of Education in its annual report to Congress noted that the population of students identified as LD more than doubled between 1977 and 1982 (U.S. Office of Special Education, 1984). Perhaps the single most critical factor related to this increase in the identification of children as learning disabled has been the lack of agreement as to the definition of a learning disability.

Since 1955 when Lehtinen (1955) first used the term "learning disability", numerous definitions have evolved. Sutaria (1985) provides a review and a discussion of these definitions and concludes that no one definition has been able to satisfy everyone. According to Bryan and Bryan (1978), there "remains little agreement of those conditions defining a specific learning disability" (p. 30). When P. L. 94-142 was passed, a broad definition of learning disabilities was used because it was believed that there was "still much research required to further delineate the components of specific learning disabilities" (Federal Register, November 29, 1976, p. 52404).

A great deal of controversy over the Federal definition

exists today. Variations of the definition are currently used by the states in the identification and placement of students into special education programs. Berdine and Blackhurst (1985) reported that a recent survey "found that 44 percent of the states are now using the 1977 federal definition without modification, while an additional 18 percent are using it with slight variation; 24 percent of the states use other definitions; and 4 percent do not use an LD definition at all" (p. 394). Within each state, there may be even more variance. Lerner (1981) stated that the "number of children identified as learning disabled is largely dependent upon the definition one uses and the identification procedures one implements" (p. 16). This lack of consensus concerning the definition of a learning disability allows the individual school districts the latitude to identify students from either a narrow or broad perspective. These problems of inconsistency were highlighted in a recent study by Ysseldyke, Algozzine, and Epps (1983) who, in a study comparing students labeled as LD and nonlabeled students who were having difficulty in school, "found no specific characteristics that differentiated the groups" (p. 160). Studies such as those cited above have led to a number of philosophical stances concerning definitions of learning disabilities. One such definitional viewpoint that has received considerable attention of late involves the use of various discrepancy formulae (e.g., Boyan, 1985; Reynolds, 1985).

In classifying a child as learning disabled through the use of a discrepancy formula, the child's potential for academic

achievement is first calculated, usually through the use of a standardized test of intelligence (e.g., WISC-R). Then, his/her actual level of achievement is measured, and the discrepancy between potential and actual achievement is calculated. If this discrepancy is considered to be significant, then the child may be declared eligible for LD services if a multidisciplinary team concurs. Many different formulae have been suggested, and some have gained acceptance in state definitions of learning disabilities (e.g., California now includes a discrepancy formula as a part of the decision making process). However, not everyone would support the use of discrepancy formulae (for a review, see Reynolds, 1984).

These and other problems in definitional differences were thoroughly reviewed by Kavale and Forness (1985) who concluded that the field of learning disabilities is really in a preparadigmatic period, i.e., that the work in the field should reflect explorations of a variety of theories and definitional stances in order that one might come to the forefront. In keeping with this spirit, the first step to be taken is to conduct a thorough baseline analysis of the current state of affairs. The purpose of this project was to study, for the Illinois State Board of Education, the characteristics of children who are now classified as learning disabled in the State of Illinois.

Method

Objectives and Data Collection

The Illinois State Board of Education delineated five major objectives for this study:

1. To determine what regular education remedial services are available to students identified as learning disabled (LD) in conjunction with their special education services.
2. To determine how students identified as LD are selected to participate in the special education program.
3. To determine the percentage of time per day the students identified as LD receive special services.
4. To determine what special areas of need tend to be emphasized in programs for students identified as LD.
5. To determine if there are demographic or other variables associated with the identification process related to students labeled learning disabled on a statewide, regional, and local basis.

The Illinois State Board of Education also provided a list of 67 randomly selected throughout the state and a list of randomly selected students who had been classified as learning disabled in these districts. During the months of September 1985 through February 1986, trained individuals from Eastern Illinois University visited each of the sites and completed the student and teacher checklists for that particular district (see Appendix I for a copy of the checklists). Training for the data collectors consisted of a general orientation meeting where the definitions

and procedures were discussed (Appendix I) and at least bi-weekly, individual meetings with the director or assistant director to discuss problems in data collection or definitions. Of the approximately 2000 student names provided by the Illinois State Board of Education, files were available for 1349 students. The primary problem seemed to be that the most current list available was for students who were enrolled in classes for children labeled learning disabled during academic year 1983-1984. Since the data were collected during 1985-1986, many of the students had left the districts (generally through graduation or moves). However, there was no differential loss of students among the districts, so the remaining sample was felt to be both representative and adequate.

Analysis

The Illinois State Board of Education requested specifically that analytic procedures be designed to provide:

1. statewide baseline information as to how the State of Illinois is serving the population of students identified as learning disabled;
2. the nature of the services provided; and
3. variation in practices which may be associated with certain specific community level variables.

In order to address these concerns, the data were entered into data sets and analyzed through various statistics available through the computing center of Eastern Illinois University. Generally, frequency tables were prepared and differences were examined either through a Kruskal-Wallis oneway analysis of

variance or through the use of a chi-square.

Results

Student Variables

Information was obtained from all of the 67 randomly selected districts on a total of 1349 students. However, the data presented on the variables do not always reflect this total since complete information on all students was not available in some cases. Table 1 presents the information on the student variables for the entire state. More boys than girls (920 (69%) versus 413 (31%)) were classified as learning disabled. The average age of the population was 161.1 months, with a range from 61 to 249 months. Students from all grade levels were a part of the sample.

In addressing Objective 5, data on various demographic variables were collected. The large majority of the sample were not receiving any chronic medications (only 5.1% had any indications in their files that they were administered medication on a regular basis). However, 38.5% of the students had been retained in at least one grade and 24.8% came from single parent families. Most (99.2%) had English as their primary language, and 15.4% had been previously referred for special services but had not been found eligible prior to their classification as learning disabled.

Objective 1 asked what other type of services might be provided for the students in the sample. Speech therapy was the most common and was provided for 16.6% of the students. The other services (social work, psychological or counseling services, and/or occupational and physical therapy) were less common in

Table 1

Combined Totals

Sex:	920 Male	413 Female
Age:	Average= 161.1 mo.	Range= 61-249 mo.
Grade Level:	Preschool	22
	1	38
	2	80
	3	112
	4	131
	5	114
	6	138
	7	161
	8	132
	9	112
	10	113
	11	113
	12	58
Medication:	1,208 No	65 Yes
Retained in Grade:	787 No	494 Yes
Single Parent:	972 No	321 Yes
Previously Referred:	1,067 No	194 Yes
Non English Speaking:	1,255 No	10 Yes
Speech Services Received:	1,171 No	233 Yes
Psychology or Counseling:	1,295 No	55 Yes
Social Work Services:	1,283 No	65 Yes
OT/PT Services:	1,322 No	24 Yes
IQ Tests Used:	WISC-R:	978
	Stanford Binet:	120
	K-ABC:	10
	Slosson:	83
	Other:	32
Average IQ:	WISC-R	90.4
	Stanford Binet	88.3
	K-ABC	98.0
	Slosson	94.5
	Others	96.5
	Overall Total	90.65

Table 1 cont'd.

Reading Recognition
Percentiles:
Average: 27.7

Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
41	4.7	2	0.2
25	2.8	22	2.3
22	2.5	2	0.2
42	4.8	7	0.8
30	3.4	2	0.2
17	1.9	23	2.5
26	3.0	3	0.3
22	2.5	17	1.9
23	2.6	22	2.5
27	3.1	10	1.1
4	0.5	17	1.9
18	2.1	1	0.1
20	2.3	2	0.2
17	1.9		
5	0.6	10	1.1
33	3.8	1	0.1
4	0.5	3	0.3
14	1.6	8	0.9
32	3.6	6	0.7
2	0.2	2	0.2
38	4.3	5	0.6
5	0.6	1	0.1
29	3.3	8	0.9
1	0.1	4	0.5
24	2.7	1	0.1
1	0.1	8	0.9
19	2.2	1	0.1
1	0.1	3	0.3
3	0.3	1	0.1
20	2.3	4	0.5
2	0.2	5	0.6
13	1.5	2	0.2
1	0.1	3	0.3
16	1.8	2	0.2
4	0.5	2	0.2
1	0.1	1	0.1
21	2.4	1	0.1
2	0.2	1	0.1
18	2.1	4	0.5
1	0.1	3	0.3
		1	0.1
		2	0.2
		2	0.2
		1	0.1
		1	0.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1 cont'd.

Reading Recognition
Standard Score
Average: 88.0

Frequency	St. Score	Frequency	St. Score
1	0.1	31	3.4
1	0.1	27	3.0
1	0.1	20	2.2
1	0.1	22	2.4
1	0.1	17	1.9
1	0.1	23	2.5
2	0.2	26	2.9
1	0.1	18	2.0
2	0.2	25	2.8
2	0.2	8	0.9
2	0.2	28	3.1
2	0.2	16	1.8
2	0.2	21	2.3
6	0.7	9	1.0
2	0.2	18	2.0
3	0.3	8	0.9
4	0.4	10	1.1
7	0.8	8	0.9
7	0.8	8	0.9
7	0.8	6	0.7
8	0.9	10	1.1
12	1.3	5	0.6
10	1.1	8	0.9
14	1.6	4	0.4
19	2.1	4	0.4
23	2.5	5	0.6
18	2.0	2	0.2
10	1.1	3	0.3
17	1.9	2	0.2
25	2.8	3	0.3
22	2.4	1	0.1
24	2.7	1	0.1
25	2.8	4	0.4
23	2.5	3	0.3
19	2.1	1	0.1
21	2.3	2	0.2
36	4.0	2	0.2
16	1.8	1	0.1
35	3.9	1	0.1
39	4.3	1	0.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reading Recognition
Tests Used:

Wrat: 767
Woodcock-Johnson: 19
PIAT: 81
IRI: 3
SRA: 2
ITBS: 3
Metropolitan Ach: 3
Woodcock Reading Mas: 6
Kaufman: 5

Table 1 cont'd.

Reading Comprehension
Percentiles:
Average: 25.6

Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
18	15.7	1	0.9
1	0.9	1	0.9
2	1.7	4	3.5
2	1.7	4	3.5
4	3.5	2	1.7
4	3.5	2	1.7
4	3.5	3	2.6
1	0.9	2	1.7
3	2.6	1	0.9
1	0.9	1	0.9
1	0.9	1	0.9
3	2.6	2	1.7
1	0.9	1	0.9
5	4.3	1	0.9
2	1.7	1	0.9
2	1.7	2	1.7
1	0.9	1	0.9
3	2.6	1	0.9
3	2.6	1	0.9
2	1.7	1	0.9
2	1.7	1	0.9
1	0.9	1	0.9
1	0.9	1	0.9
3	2.6	1	0.9
4	3.5	1	0.9
1	0.9	1	0.9
2	1.7		

Reading Comprehension
Standard Scores:
Average: 89.9

Frequency	St. Score	Frequency	St. Score
1	1.1	1	1.1
1	1.1	1	1.1
1	1.1	6	6.3
1	1.1	4	4.2
1	1.1	3	3.2
1	1.1	3	3.2
3	3.2	1	1.1
1	1.1	2	2.1
5	5.3	1	1.1
4	4.2	1	1.1
4	4.2	2	2.1
1	1.1	1	1.1
4	4.2	2	2.1
6	6.3	1	1.1
4	4.2	1	1.1
4	4.2	1	1.1
4	4.2	1	1.1
3	3.2	1	1.1
2	2.1	1	1.1
4	4.2	1	1.1
3	3.2	1	1.1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reading Comprehension
Tests Used:

Kaufman: 3
Woodcock-Johnson 3
PIAT 77
Woodcock Reading Mas: 4

Table 1 cont'd.

Reading Percentiles:
Average: 19.5

Percent	Frequency
1	2
2	1
13	1
16	1
81	1

**Reading Standard
Scores:
Average: 33**

Percent	Frequency
9.6	1
5.6	1
5.6	1
5.6	1
5.6	1
5.6	1
5.6	1
5.6	1
11.1	2
5.6	1
5.6	1
5.6	1
5.6	1
5.6	1

Reading Test Used:

**Kaufman
WRAT
PIAT**

12
4
1

**Math Computation
Percentile:
Average:25.9**

Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
0.1	1	0.1	1
4.4	38	2.3	20
3.3	28	0.6	5
2.4	21	0.6	5
4.2	36	0.1	1
4.2	36	1.0	9
2.7	23	1.9	16
1.9	16	0.1	1
2.0	17	0.2	2
3.4	29	0.6	5
2.4	21	0.1	1
3.7	32	1.0	9
3.7	32	0.1	1
2.4	21	1.5	13
0.1	1	0.1	1
2.6	22	0.8	7
0.6	5	0.1	1
3.7	32	0.5	4
3.0	26	1.6	14
0.3	3	0.1	1
3.1	27	0.3	3
3.8	33	0.2	2
0.1	1	0.7	6
2.3	20	0.3	3
0.1	1	0.1	1
3.6	31	0.2	2
0.1	1	0.1	1
0.3	3	0.2	2
2.7	23	0.2	2
0.1	1	0.1	1
3.1	27	0.3	3
2.6	22	0.1	1
0.1	1	0.1	1
0.2	2	0.2	2
2.3	20	0.2	2
0.2	2	0.5	4
0.2	2	0.1	1
0.9	8	0.2	2
2.1	18	0.3	3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1 cont'd.

Math Computation
Standard Score:
Average 85.2

Frequency	St. Score	Frequency	St. Score
14	1.5	28	3.0
1	0.1	28	3.0
1	0.1	33	3.6
1	0.1	25	2.7
4	0.4	33	3.6
1	0.1	27	2.9
1	0.1	28	3.0
1	0.1	21	2.3
3	0.3	22	2.4
3	0.3	24	2.6
1	0.1	10	1.1
2	0.2	17	1.8
2	0.2	19	2.1
2	0.2	11	1.2
5	0.5	11	1.2
2	0.2	16	1.7
9	1.0	7	0.8
6	0.6	9	1.0
4	0.4	15	1.6
13	1.4	8	0.9
7	0.8	5	0.5
9	1.0	16	1.7
10	1.1	2	0.2
12	1.3	7	0.8
26	2.8	5	0.5
12	1.3	2	0.2
19	2.1	2	0.2
18	1.9	2	0.2
24	2.6	1	0.1
18	1.9	2	0.2
15	1.6	2	0.2
29	3.1	2	0.2
21	2.3	3	0.3
35	3.8	1	0.1
31	3.4	1	0.1
23	2.5	1	0.1
25	2.7	1	0.1
40	4.3	1	0.1

Math Computation Tests:

Kaufman ABC:	9
WRAT:	777
Woodcock-Johnson:	20
PIAT:	72
Key Math:	8
SRA:	2
ITBS:	6
Metropolitan Ach.	12

Math Applications
Percentile:
Average: 39.4

Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
9.7	6	1.6	1
3.2	2	4.8	3
1.6	1	1.6	1
9.7	6	1.6	1
3.2	2	3.2	2
1.6	1	4.8	3
4.8	3	6.5	4
3.2	2	1.6	1
1.6	1	1.6	1
1.6	1	1.6	1
3.2	2	1.6	1
1.6	1	11.3	7
1.6	1	1.6	1
1.6	1	8.1	5

Math Application
Standard Score:
Average: 79.6

St. Score	Frequency
3.3	1
3.3	1
6.7	2
3.3	1
3.3	1
13.3	4
6.7	2
6.7	2
3.3	1
3.3	1
3.3	1
3.3	1
6.7	1
3.3	2
3.3	1
3.3	1
3.3	1
6.7	2
3.3	1
3.3	1
3.3	1

Math Application
Tests Used:

Kaufman: 1
WRAT: 17
Woodcock Johnson: 1
PIAT: 9

Spelling Percentile:
Average: 24.7

Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency
5.9	48	1.1	9
3.8	31	0.1	1
4.0	33	1.6	13
3.9	32	2.3	19
4.9	40	0.7	6
2.0	16	0.1	1
3.9	32	1.5	12
3.4	28	0.1	1
3.2	26	0.1	1
3.1	25	1.1	9
0.2	2	0.1	1
1.6	15	1.1	9
2.7	22	1.0	8
2.1	17	0.1	1
0.4	3	0.6	5
3.2	26	0.1	1
0.4	3	0.6	5
2.8	23	0.9	7
1.7	14	0.9	7
2.7	22	0.1	1
0.1	1	0.6	5
2.8	23	0.1	1
0.1	1	0.6	5
4.8	39	0.1	1
0.1	1	0.4	3
2.7	22	0.2	2
0.1	1	0.6	5
2.1	17	0.4	3
2.6	21	0.4	3
2.6	21	0.1	1
0.2	2	0.1	1
0.1	1	0.4	3
1.6	15	0.1	1
2.8	23	0.1	1
0.2	2	0.2	2
0.1	1	0.1	1
2.1	17	0.1	1

Spelling Standard
Score:
Average: 86.4

St. Score	Frequency	St. Score	Frequency
0.1	1	2.9	25
0.1	1	4.7	40
0.1	1	2.8	24
0.1	1	2.4	20
0.1	1	2.5	21
0.2	2	2.8	24
0.2	2	1.3	13
0.2	2	3.1	26
0.8	7	2.1	18
0.7	6	1.2	10
0.2	2	1.9	16
0.8	7	1.9	16
0.8	7	0.8	7
1.1	9	1.8	15
0.6	5	1.3	11
1.9	16	1.2	10
0.7	6	0.9	8
0.9	8	0.7	6
2.3	22	0.7	6
1.3	11	0.9	8
1.9	16	0.8	7
1.6	14	0.7	6
3.1	26	0.7	6
2.2	19	0.4	3
1.9	16	0.2	2
3.8	32	0.6	5
3.3	30	0.4	3
3.2	27	0.4	3
2.7	23	0.1	1
2.2	19	0.1	1
2.9	25	0.4	3
2.7	23	0.1	1
3.3	28	0.1	1
2.9	25	0.1	1
1.6	14	0.2	2
2.8	24	0.1	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1 cont'd.

Spelling Tests Used:

Kaufman:	2
WRAT:	764
Woodcock-Johnson:	5
PIAT:	78

Type of Services:

Resource
Self-Contained
Consultation

Frequency	Average
876	352 min/wk
394	443 min/wk
68	65 min/wk

Reasons for Referral:

Reading

191

Frequency	Percent
15.1	
27	2.1
76	6.0
3	.2
74	5.9
548	43.4
10	.8
19	1.5
316	25.0

Math
Language
Spelling
Behavior
Academics
Perception
Immaturity
Attention Deficit

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Annual Goals Listed:

Frequency	Percent
703	12.6
741	13.3
581	10.4
570	10.2
571	10.2
488	8.7
455	8.1
259	4.6
355	6.4
220	3.9
223	4.0
122	2.2
11	.2
1	.1
8	.1
1	.1
272	4.9
8	.1
1	.1

Reading Recognition
Reading Comprehension
Reading
Math Calculation
Math Computation
Math
Written Language
Receptive Language
Expressive Language
Spelling
Language
Behavior
Perception
Science
Soc Studies/History/Civics
Drivers Ed.
Pass Classes
Voc. Ed.
Other

19

their provision and were received by less than 6% of the total sample.

Objective 2 was designed to examine the criteria that were used to identify students as learning disabled. By far, the most common IQ test used was the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised (WISC-R). This test was used in the original classification of 80.3% of the sample. The Stanford-Binet was the next most common IQ test and was used in 9.9% of the cases. These tests were followed by the Slosson Intelligence Test (6.7%), the Kaufman Achievement Battery for Children (.8%), and a combination of other tests (2.3%). These tests resulted in an overall average IQ of 90.65 (WISC-R - 90.4; SB - 88.3; Slosson - 94.5; K-ABC - 98.0; and others - 96.5). If only the WISC-R IQ's are considered since this was the most commonly-used instrument, the average IQ was significantly below the expected population mean of 100.

In addition to the IQ testing, academic achievement testing was conducted as a part of the classification process for most of the students. The most common achievement test used across districts was the Wide Range Achievement Test (approximately 86.2% of the students who were tested had scores recorded from the WRAT), however for about 24% of the sample, no achievement data were available. Other standardized tests that were used either in conjunction with the WRAT or instead of the WRAT included the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, the Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Battery, the Keymath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test, the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests, and the SRA Achievement Test,

the Metropolitan Achievement Test, and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

The average reading recognition percentile rank was 27.7, with an average standard score of 88.0. For reading comprehension, the mean percentile was 25.6 with a standard score of 89.9. For mathematics computation the mean percentiles and standard scores were 25.9 and 85.2; for mathematics applications they were 39.4 and 79.6, while for spelling they were 24.7 and 86.4. All of these averages indicate that the children in the sample were performing below their expected age level in the academic areas in which they were assessed.

Students were referred for consideration for classification as learning disabled for a variety of reasons. However, the most common reason was an inability to perform academically commensurate with his/her peers. This reason for referral accounted for 43.4% of the children who eventually were classified. The second largest area that was found was an attention deficit that accounted for 25.0% of the referrals. This area was followed by reading problems (15.1%), language deficits (6.0%), behavior (5.9%), mathematics difficulties (2.1%), immaturity (1.5%), perceptual deficits (0.8%), and spelling problems (0.2%).

Objective 3 was designed to determine what type of special services were received by the sample and the amount of time the students spent in special and general education. Most (65.5%) of the students were served through resource programs, and they spent

an average of 5 hours 52 minutes per week (19.5% of their time based on a 30-hour school week) receiving these services. The second-most common service delivery system was a self-contained program which served 29.4% of the sample. These students (who, by definition are served through special education programs more than 50% of the time), spent an average of 24.6% (7 hours 23 minutes per week) of their time in general education. The remainder of the students (5.1%) received consultation services. On the average, their special education teachers spent 65 minutes per week consulting with the general education teachers. Generally, this was accommodated by a resource teacher as part of his/her duties.

The goal of Objective 4 was to determine what areas of special need tend to be emphasized for children who are labeled as learning disabled. To address this objective, the annual goals that were listed on the students' 1984-85 IEP's were examined. The most common goals involved reading (a total of 36.3% of the total). This area was followed by mathematics (29.1%), language (23.1%), passing classes (4.9%), spelling (3.9%), and behavior (2.2%). Six other areas (perception, science, social studies/history/civics, drivers' education, vocational education, and others) accounted for less than one half of one percent of the total goals listed. Interestingly, the goal of perceptual improvement, a classical descriptor of learning disabilities, was reflected in only 0.2% of the annual goals.

Table 2 presents the data on how districts are presently

classifying students as learning disabled and the percent of students who are currently classified (Objective 2). In order to address objective 5, these data were then sorted by the: (a) area code of the districts' offices (Table 3), (b) size of the town in which the district was located (Table 4), (c) number of students enrolled in the district (Table 5), and (d) the per capita tuition cost (Table 6). Overall, the percent of students who were classified as learning disabled was 5.82%. A Kruskal-Wallis oneway analysis of variance was then used to determine if there were any differences in these percentages across the various groupings. No significant differences were noted.

When examining the other variables, while no significant patterns presented themselves, (a) districts in area code 309 (the central section of the state) were slightly more likely to have specific entrance requirements than districts in other area codes, (b) very few districts with an area code of 618 (the southern part of the state) used any type of discrepancy formulae; (c) districts in towns of more than 30000 population and those less than 2000 population used discrepancy formulae more often than others; (d) districts in towns of less than 2000 population used principals as supervisors less often; (e) districts of more than 2000 students and those with student populations between 200 and 500 students used specific entrance requirements and IQ cutoffs more often; and (f) discrepancy formulae were used most often in districts with student populations between 200 and 500. However, while these data are interesting, there were no specific patterns

Table 2

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: Sch. Dist.

Page 1

4/9/86

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ	C	Cost	% LD	# Students
1 50082116002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85		\$2,233	4%	329
2 50082115002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85		\$1,981	13%	328
3 31045301026	Psych.			NLE			\$2,583	6%	1,202
4 49081036002	LD Tch.	yes	yes		70		\$2,450	7%	257
5 02002001022	Prin.	no	no		no		\$3,691	4%	1,300
6 13014001026	Co-op	no	no		no		\$2,026	8%	1,401
7 42058133002	Co-op	no	no		no		\$1,959	8%	305
8 24032001026	Psych.	yes	yes		85		\$2,559	6%	1,554
9 36052170022	Supv.	no	no		85		\$2,559	6%	3,266
10 17064003026	Prin.	yes	yes		no		\$3,166	2%	611
11 37053230017	Prin.	yes	yes		no		\$3,418	3%	291
12 37053232002							\$1,607	6%	574
13 49081030017	Tch.	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl.	85		\$3,286	8%	207
14 50082189022	Tch. & S	yes	no		no		\$2,907	2%	18,706
15 41057007026	Prin.	no	no		no		\$2,323	6%	4575
16 30039196026	Co-op A	Yes	no		no		\$2,150	9%	550
17 20096225016	Tch.	no	no		no		\$2,952	5%	603
18 17020017026	Prin.	yes	?		no		\$2,497	10%	850
19 08043120022	Prin.	no	no		no		\$2,139	7%	1,160
20 28037224026	Coord.	no	no		?		\$2,034	5%	766
21 31045304026	Pycho.			NCE			\$2,926	6%	1,969
22 28037228026	Coord.			no			\$1,909	4%	3,117
23 37053425004	Pycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	80		\$2,711	11%	63
24 26034328024	Princ.	no	no		no		\$2,010	3%	960
25 14016086002	Soc. Wk	yes	yes	no	85		\$3,711	5%	385
26 44063019024	Pycho.	no	no	no	no		\$2,965	5%	450
27 43059020013	Supv.	yes	yes	Std. Scr.	85		\$2,991	1%	288
28 13095011004	Co-op	no	no	no	no		\$2,072	5%	135
29 32046111025	Pycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	70		\$2,690	8%	5,480
30 35050122002	Pycho.	no	no	no			\$2,388	9%	638
31 15051020026							\$2,417	3%	1,811
32 10068012026	Prin.	no	no	no	no		\$2,557	6%	1,550
33 44063140003	Pycho.			Regrs.	no		\$2,900	12%	450
34 50082040026	Prin.	no	no	no	no		\$2,343	6%	873
35 53090102002	Supv.	no	no		no		\$1,844	2%	819
36 38060123026	Supv.	No	no	Tch. refer	no		\$2,447	7%	574
37 02077101026	All	no	no	no	no		\$3,227	4%	1,123
38 24032101016	Gde. Cs	no	no		no		\$5,727	3%	748
39 14016026002	Pycho.	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl.	no		\$3,080	9%	1,269
40 25041082002	Pycho.	yes			yes		\$2,460	3%	260
41 24047018016	Prin.	No	no	no	no		\$4,354	12%	145
42 12040001026							\$3,028	5%	1,947
43 17064005026	Prin.	Yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	75		\$2,113	4%	6,570
44 52089203026	Pycho.	no	no		no		\$2,415	3%	555

Table 2 cont'd.

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: Sch. Dist.

Page 2

4/9/86

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ C	Cost	% LD	# Students
45 24047308026	Prin.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	no	\$2,203	5%	3,985
46 35050230004	Pycho.	yes	yes	nc	no	\$3,856	5%	93
47 11023095025	Tch.	no	no	no	80	\$2,539	4%	2,005
48 53090108002	Supv.	no	no	no		\$1,852	6%	4,261
49 48072150025	LD Coord	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl.	75	\$2,599	5%	18,000
50 48072069002	Supv.-T	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl.		\$1,668	9%	250
51 30073050002	Prin.	yes				\$1,699	3%	657
52 01075010026	Prin.	yes	yes	Gde. Le1. D	no	\$2,009	8%	1,582
53 24047088026	Cous.	no	no	no	no	\$2,241	7%	1,181
54 04004200026	Dir. Sp	yes	yes	Achv. Le1.	75	\$2,131	7%	933
55 01001172022	Prin.	yes	no		75	\$1,452	5%	6,825
56 09010193017	Prin.	yes	yes	Achv. Le1.	85	\$3,101	3%	1,004
57 09010137002	Prin.	yes	yes	St. Sc. Di	80	\$2,006	2%	2,398
58 49081041025	Cs. Mgr	yes	yes	Grd. Le1.	85	\$2,273	5%	7,475
59 04101140004	Prin..	no	no		no	\$2,475	8%	639
60 45079140026	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,274	8%	2,052
61 17064016026	Prin.	yes	yes	no	no	\$3,150	8%	2,195
62 22029087002	Psych.	no	no	screen	no	\$2,266	1%	94
63 45067063026	Psych.	no	no		85	\$3,132	4%	510
64 40056004026	tch.	no	no	no	yes	\$1,829	7%	1,086
65 05009064026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Le1.	75	\$2,277	9%	467
66 53090051002	Supv.	no	no	no	no	\$1,840	5%	550
67 46066001026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Le1.	no	\$2,282	5%	785

Table 3

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: Area Code

Selection: Area Code equals 217

Page 1

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
01901172022	Prin.	yes	no		75	\$1,452	5%	6,825	42,554	217
61075010026	Prin.	yes	yes	Gde. Lel. Dis	no	\$2,009	8%	1,582	4,170	217
05009064026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Lel. Di	75	\$2,277	9%	467	1,825	217
09010137002	Prin.	yes	yes	St. Sc. Dis.	80	\$2,006	2%	2,398	20,161 a	217
09010193017	Prin.	yes	yes	Achv. Lel. E	85	\$3,101	3%	1,004	20,161 a	217
10066012026	Prin.	no	no	no	no	\$2,557	6%	1,551	7,604	217
11023095025	Tch.	no	no	no	80	\$2,539	4%	2,005	9,695	217
26034320024	Princ.	no	no	no	no	\$2,010	3%	960	3,509 a	217
38060123026	Supv.	no	no	Tch. refer	no	\$2,447	7%	574	2,719	217
40054004026	tch.	no	no	no	yes	\$1,889	7%	1,086	3,895	217
46086001026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Lel. Di	no	\$2,282	5%	785	1,716	217

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: Area Code

Selection: Area Code equals 309

Page 1

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
02002001022	Prin.	no	no		no	\$3,691	4%	1,300	1,578 a	309
17020017026	Prin.	yes	?		no	\$2,497	10%	850	2,252	309
17064003026	Prin.	yes	yes		no	\$3,166	2%	611	561 a	309
17064005026	Prin.	Yes	no	Gde. Lvl. Ac	75	\$2,113	4%	6,570	35,672	309
17064016024	Prin.	yes	yes	no	no	\$3,150	8%	2,195	720 a	309
22029007002	Psych.	no	no	screen	no	\$2,266	1%	94	786	309
28037224026	Coord.	no	no		?	\$2,034	5%	766	3,185	309
31045304026	Pycho.			NCE		\$2,926	6%	1,969	6,373	309
43059023013	Supv.	yes	yes	Std. Scr.	85	\$2,991	1%	288	2,740	309
48072069002	Supv.-Tc	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl. &		\$1,668	9%	250	124,160	309
48072159025	LD Coord	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl. E	75	\$2,599	5%	18,000	124,160	309
49081030017	Tch.	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl.	85	\$3,286	8%	207	20,907 a	309
49081036002	LD Tch.	yes	yes		70	\$2,450	7%	257	5,931	309
49081041025	Cs. Mgr.	yes	yes	Grd. Lel.	85	\$2,273	5%	7,475	46,821	309
53090051002	Supv.	no	no	no	no	\$1,840	5%	550	10,364 a	309
53090102002	Supv.	no	no		no	\$1,844	2%	819	3,386 a	309
53090108002	Supv.	no	no	no		\$1,852	6%	4,261	33,967	309

Table 3 cont'd.

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: Area Code

Selection: Area Code equals 312

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
14016926002	Pycho.	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl.	no	\$3,080	9%	1,269	52,634	312
14016926002	Soc. Wkr	yes	yes	no	85	\$3,711	5%	395	8,228 a	312
24047388026	Cous.	no	no	no	no	\$2,241	7%	1,181	4,875	312
24047388026	Prin.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl. Di	no	\$2,203	5%	3,988	3,021 a	312
28037228026	Coord.			no		\$1,909	4%	3,117	9,881 a	312
31045301026	Psych.			NLE		\$2,583	6%	1,202	442	312

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: Area Code

Selection: Area Code equals 618

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
12040001026						\$3,028	5%	1,947	3,186	618
13014001026	Co-op	no	no		no	\$2,026	8%	1,401	3,388	618
15051020026						\$2,417	3%	1,811	5,652	618
20096225016	Tch.	no	no		no	\$2,952	5%	603	5,954	618
25041082002	Pycho.	yes			yes	\$2,460	3%	260	17,193	618
30039196026	Co-op As	Yes	no		no	\$2,150	9%	550	973	618
30073053002	Prin.	yes				\$1,699	3%	657	3,319	618
41057007026	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,323	6%	4575	12,480 a	618
42058133002	Co-op	no	no		no	\$1,959	8%	305	15,126	618
45067003026	Psych.	no	no		85	\$3,132	4%	510	896	618
45079140026	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,274	8%	2,052	4,976	618
50082040026	Prin.	no	no	no	no	\$2,343	6%	873	2,568	618
50082115002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85	\$1,981	13%	328	41,580	618
50082116002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85	\$2,233	4%	329	41,580	618
50082169022	Tch. & Su	yes	no		no	\$2,907	2%	18,706	55,200	618

Table 3 cont'd.

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: Area Code

Selection: Area Code equals 815

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
02077101026	All	no	no	no	no	\$3,227	4%	1,123	8,833	815
04004200026	Dir. Sp.	yes	yes	Achv. Le1. E	75	\$2,131	7%	933	818	815
04101140004	Prin..	no	no		no	\$2,475	8%	639	2,313 a	815
08043120022	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,139	7%	1,160	3,876	815
24032001026	Psych.	yes	yes		85	\$2,553	6%	1,554	3,028	815
24032101016	Gde. Cs1	no	no		no	\$5,727	3%	746	1,669	815
24047018016	Prin.	No	no	no	no	\$4,354	12%	145	796	815
32046111025	Pycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lv1.	70	\$2,690	8%	5,480	30,166	815
35050122002	Pycho.	no	no	no		\$2,388	9%	630	10,347	815
35050250004	Pycho.	yes	yes	no	no	\$3,856	5%	93	18,166	815
36052170022	Supv.	no	no		85	\$2,559	6%	3,266	15,710	815
37053230017	Prin.	yes	yes		no	\$3,418	3%	291	4,416	815
37053332002						\$1,667	6%	574	4,146	815
37053425004	Pycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lv1.	80	\$2,711	11%	63		815
44063019024	Pycho.	no	no	no	no	\$2,965	5%	450	786	815
44063141003	Pycho.			Regrs.	no	\$2,900	12%	450	4,361	815
52089203026	Pycho.	no	no		no	\$2,415	3%	555	598	815

Table 4

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: town size

Selection: Town Size is greater than 30,000

or Town Size ends with A

Page 1

4/10/86

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
01001172022	Prin.	yes	no		75	\$1,452	5%	6,825	42,554	217
09010137002	Prin.	yes	yes	St. Sc. Dis.	80	\$2,006	2%	2,398	20,161 a	217
09010193017	Prin.	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl. Ex	85	\$3,101	3%	1,004	20,161 a	217
26034328024	Princ.	no	no		no	\$2,010	3%	960	3,509 a	217
02002001022	Prin.	no	no		no	\$3,691	4%	1,300	1,578 a	309
17064003026	Prin.	yes	yes		no	\$3,166	2%	611	561 a	309
17064005026	Prin.	Yes	no	Gde. Lvl. Ach	75	\$2,113	4%	6,570	35,672	309
17064016026	Prin.	yes	yes	no	no	\$3,150	8%	2,195	720 a	309
48072069002	Supv.-Tc	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl. & 6		\$1,668	9%	250	124,160	309
48072158025	LD Coord	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl. Ex	75	\$2,599	5%	18,000	124,160	309
49081030017	Tch.	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl.	85	\$3,286	8%	207	20,907 a	309
49081041025	Cs. Mgr.	yes	yes	Grd. Lvl.	85	\$2,272	5%	7,475	46,821	309
53090051002	Supv.	no	no	no	no	\$1,840	5%	550	10,364 a	309
53090102002	Supv.	no	no	no	no	\$1,844	2%	819	3,386 a	309
53090108002	Supv.	no	no	no	no	\$1,852	6%	4,261	33,967	309
14016026002	Psycho.	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl.	no	\$3,080	9%	1,269	52,634	312
14016084002	Soc. Wkr	yes	yes	no	85	\$3,711	5%	385	8,228 a	312
24047308026	Prin.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl. Dis	no	\$2,203	5%	3,986	3,021 a	312
28037228026	Coord.			no		\$1,909	4%	3,117	9,881 a	312
41057007026	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,323	6%	4575	12,480 a	618
50082115002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85	\$1,981	13%	328	41,580	618
50082116002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85	\$2,233	4%	329	41,580	618
50082189022	Tch. & Su	yes	no		no	\$2,907	2%	18,706	55,200	618
04101140004	Prin..	no	no		no	\$2,475	8%	639	2,313 a	815
32046111025	Psycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	70	\$2,690	8%	5,480	30,166	815

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: town size

Selection: Town Size is greater than 7,501

and Town Size does not contain A

and Town Size is less than 30,000

Page 1

4/10/86

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
10068012026	Prin.	no	no	no	no	\$2,557	6%	1,550	7,604	217
11023095025	Tch.	no	no	no	80	\$2,539	4%	2,005	9,885	217
25041082002	Psycho.	yes			yes	\$2,460	3%	260	17,193	618
42058133002	Co-op	no	no		no	\$1,959	8%	305	15,126	618
02077101026	All	no	no	no	no	\$3,227	4%	1,123	8,833	815
35050122002	Psycho.	no	no	no		\$2,388	9%	636	10,347	815
35050230004	Psycho.	yes	yes	no	no	\$3,856	5%	93	18,166	815
36052170022	Supv.	no	no		85	\$2,559	6%	3,266	15,710	815

Table 4 cont'd.

4/10/86

Report: town size

Selection: Town Size is greater than 2,000:

and Town Size does not contain A

and Town Size is less than 7,500

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
01075010026	Prin.	yes	yes	Gde.Lel. Dis.	no	\$2,009	8%	1,582	4,170	217
38060123026	Supv.	No	no	Tch. refer	no	\$2,447	7%	574	2,719	217
40956004026	tch.	no	no	no	yes	\$1,829	7%	1,086	3,895	217
17020017026	Prin.	yes	?		no	\$2,497	10%	850	2,252	309
28037224026	Coord.	no	no		?	\$2,034	5%	766	3,185	309
31045394026	Pycho.			NCE		\$2,926	6%	1,969	6,373	309
43057020013	Supv.	yes	yes	Std. Scr.	85	\$2,991	1%	288	2,740	309
49081034002	LD Tch.	yes	yes		70	\$2,450	7%	257	5,931	309
24047088026	Cous.	no	no	no	no	\$2,241	7%	1,181	4,875	312
12040001026						\$3,028	5%	1,947	3,126	618
13014001026	Co-op	no	no		no	\$2,026	8%	1,401	3,388	618
15051020026						\$2,417	3%	1,611	5,652	618
20096225016	Tch.	no	no		no	\$2,952	5%	603	5,954	618
30073050002	Prin.	yes				\$1,699	3%	657	3,319	618
45079140026	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,274	8%	2,052	4,976	618
50082040026	Prin.	no	no	no	no	\$2,343	6%	873	2,560	618
08043120022	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,139	7%	1,160	3,876	815
2403201026	Psych.	yes	yes		85	\$2,559	6%	1,554	3,628	815
37053230017	Prin.	yes	yes		no	\$3,413	3%	291	4,416	815
37053232002						\$1,607	6%	574	4,146	815
44063140003	Pycho.			Reg's.	no	\$2,900	12%	450	4,361	815

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: town size

Selection: Town Size is less than 2,000

and Town Size does not contain A

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
05009064026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Lel. Dis	75	\$2,277	9%	467	1,825	217
46086001026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Lel. Dis	no	\$2,282	5%	785	1,716	217
22029087002	Pycho.	no	no	screen	no	\$2,266	1%	94	786	309
31045301026	Pycho.			NLE		\$2,583	6%	1,202	442	312
13095011004	Co-op	no	no	no	no	\$2,072	5%	135	789	615
30039196026	Co-op As	Yes	no		no	\$2,150	9%	550	973	618
45067003026	Pycho.	no	no		85	\$3,132	4%	510	896	618
04004200026	Dir. Sp.	yes	yes	Achv. Lel. Ex	75	\$2,131	7%	933	818	815
24032101016	Gde. Csl	no	no		no	\$5,727	3%	748	1,669	815
24047018016	Prin.	No	no	no	no	\$4,354	12%	145	798	815
37053425004	Pycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	80	\$2,711	11%	63		815
44063019024	Pycho.	no	no	no	no	\$2,965	5%	450	786	815
52089203026	Pycho.	no	no		no	\$2,415	3%	555	598	815

Page 1

4/10/86

Table 5

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: student size

Selection: # Students is greater than 0
and # Students is less than 201

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
22029087002	Psych.	no	no	screen	no	\$2,266	1%	94	736	309
13095011034	Co-op	no	no	no	no	\$2,072	5%	135	789	615
24047018016	Prin.	No	no	no	no	\$4,354	12%	145	798	815
35050230004	Psycho.	yes	yes	no	no	\$3,856	5%	93	18,166	815
37053425004	Psycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	80	\$2,711	11%	63		815

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: student size

Selection: # Students is greater than 201
and # Students is less than 500

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
05009064026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Lvl. Di	75	\$2,277	9%	467	1,825	217
43059020013	Supv.	yes	yes	Std. Scr.	85	\$2,991	1%	288	2,740	309
48072069002	Supv.-Tc	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl. &		\$1,668	9%	250	124,160	309
49081030017	Tch.	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl.	85	\$3,284	8%	207	20,907 a	309
49081036002	LD Tch.	yes	yes		70	\$2,450	7%	257	5,931	309
14016086002	Soc. Wkr	yes	yes	no	85	\$3,711	5%	385	6,228 a	312
25041002002	Psycho.	yes			yes	\$2,460	3%	260	17,193	618
42058133002	Co-op	no	no		no	\$1,959	8%	305	15,126	618
50082115002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85	\$1,981	13%	328	41,580	618
50082116002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85	\$2,233	4%	329	41,580	618
37053230017	Prin.	yes	yes		no	\$3,418	3%	291	4,416	815
44063019024	Psycho.	no	no	no	no	\$2,965	5%	450	786	815
44063140003	Psycho.			Regrs.	no	\$2,900	12%	450	4,361	815

Table 5 cont'd.

Page 1

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: student size

Selection: # Students is greater than 501
and # Students is less than 1,000

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
26034328024	Princ.	no	no		no	\$2,010	3%	930	3,509 a	217
38060123026	Supv.	No	no	Tch. refer	no	\$2,447	7%	574	2,719	217
46066001026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Le1. Di	no	\$2,282	5%	785	1,716	217
17020017026	Prin.	yes	?		no	\$2,497	10%	850	2,252	309
17064003026	Prin.	yes	yes		no	\$3,156	2%	611	561 a	309
28037224026	Co-od.	no	no		?	\$2,034	5%	766	3,185	309
53090051002	Supv.	no	no	no	no	\$1,840	5%	550	10,364 a	309
53090102002	Supv.	no	no		no	\$1,844	2%	819	3,386 a	309
20096225016	Tch.	no	no		no	\$2,952	5%	603	5,954	618
30035194026	Co-op As	Yes	no		no	\$2,150	9%	550	973	618
30073050002	Prin.	yes				\$1,699	3%	657	3,319	618
4506703026	Psych.	no	no		85	\$3,132	4%	510	896	618
50082040026	Prin.	no	no	no	no	\$2,343	6%	873	2,560	618
04004200026	Dir. Sp.	yes	yes	Achv. Le1. E	75	\$2,131	7%	933	818	815
04101140004	Prin..	no	no		no	\$2,475	8%	639	2,313 a	815
24032101016	Gde. Cs:	no	no		no	\$5,727	3%	742	1,669	815
35050122002	Pycho.	no	no	no		\$2,388	9%	638	10,347	815
37053232002						\$1,607	6%	574	4,146	815
52089203026	Pycho.	no	no		no	\$2,415	3%	555	598	815

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: student size

Selection: # Students is greater than 1,001
and # Students is less than 2,000

Page 1

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
01075010026	Prin.	yes	yes	Gde. Le1. Dis	no	\$2,009	8%	1,582	4,170	217
09010193017	Prin.	yes	yes	Achv. Le1. E	85	\$3,101	3%	1,004	20,161 a	217
10068012026	Prin.	no	no	no	no	\$2,557	6%	1,550	7,604	217
4535604026	tch.	no	no	no	yes	\$1,889	7%	1,086	3,895	217
02002001022	Prin.	no	no		no	\$3,691	4%	1,300	1,578 a	309
31045304026	Pycho.			NCE		\$2,926	6%	1,969	6,373	309
14016026002	Pycho.	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl.	no	\$3,080	9%	1,269	52,634	312
24047088026	Cous.	no	no	no	no	\$2,241	7%	1,181	4,875	312
31043301026	Psych.			NLE		\$2,583	6%	1,202	442	312
12040001026						\$3,028	5%	1,947	3,186	618
13014001026	Co-op	no	no		no	\$2,026	8%	1,401	3,388	618
15051020026						\$2,417	3%	1,811	5,652	618
02077101026	At:	no	no	no	no	\$3,227	4%	1,123	8,833	815
08043120022	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,139	7%	1,160	3,876	815
24032001026	Psych.	yes	yes		85	\$2,559	6%	1,554	3,028	815

Table 5 cont'd.

Page :

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: student size

Selection: # Students is greater than 2,001

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
01051172022	Prin.	yes	no		75	\$1,452	5%	6,825	42,554	217
09010137002	Prin.	yes	yes	St. Sc. Dis.	80	\$2,006	2%	2,398	20,161 a	217
11023095025	Tch.	no	no	no	80	\$2,539	4%	2,005	9,885	217
17064005026	Prin.	Yes	no	Gde. Lvl. Ac	75	\$2,113	4%	6,570	35,672	309
17064016026	Prin.	yes	yes	no	no	\$3,150	8%	2,195	720 a	309
48072150025	LD Coord	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl. E	75	\$2,599	5%	18,000	124,160	309
49081041025	Cs. Mgr.	yes	yes	Grd. Lvl.	85	\$2,273	5%	7,475	46,821	309
53090108002	Supv.	no	no	no		\$1,852	6%	4,261	33,967	309
24047308026	Prin.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl. Di	no	\$2,203	5%	3,988	3,021 a	312
28037228026	Coord.			no		\$1,909	4%	3,117	9,881 a	312
41057007026	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,323	6%	4575	12,480 a	618
45079140026	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,274	8%	2,052	4,976	618
50082189022	Tch. & Su	yes	no		no	\$2,907	2%	18,706	55,200	618
52046111025	Psycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	70	\$2,650	8%	5,480	30,166	815
36052170022	Supv.	no	no		85	\$2,559	6%	3,266	15,710	815

Table 6

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 0
and Cost is less than 2,001

Page 1

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
01001172022	Prin.	yes	no		75	\$1,452	5%	6,825	42,554	217
40056004026	tch.	nc	nc	no	yes	\$1,889	7%	1,086	3,895	217
48072069002	Supv.-Tc	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl. & Ge		\$1,668	9%	250	124,160	309
53090051002	Supv.	no	nc	nc	no	\$1,840	5%	550	10,364 a	309
53090052002	Supv.	no	no		no	\$1,844	2%	819	3,386 a	309
53090060002	Supv.	nc	nc	nc		\$1,852	6%	4,261	33,567	309
28037228026	Coord.			no		\$1,909	4%	3,117	9,881 a	312
30073050002	Prin.	yes				\$1,699	3%	657	3,319	618
42050033002	Co-op	nc	nc		nc	\$1,959	8%	305	15,126	618
50002015002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85	\$1,981	13%	326	41,580	618
37053232002						\$1,607	6%	574	4,146	815

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 2,001
and Cost is less than 2,200

Page 1

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
01075010026	Prin.	yes	yes	Gde.Lvl. Dis.	no	\$2,009	8%	1,582	4,170	217
09010037002	Prin.	yes	yes	St. Sc. Dis.	80	\$2,006	2%	2,398	20,161 a	217
26034328024	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,010	3%	960	3,509 a	217
17064005026	Prin.	Yes	nc	Gde. Lvl. Achv	75	\$2,113	4%	6,570	35,672	309
28037224026	Coord.	no	no		?	\$2,034	5%	766	3,185	309
13095011004	Co-op	no	no	no	no	\$2,072	5%	135	789	615
13014001026	Co-op	no	no		no	\$2,026	8%	1,401	3,388	618
30039196026	Co-op As	Yes	no		no	\$2,150	9%	550	973	618
04004200026	Dir. Sp.	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl. Exp	75	\$2,131	7%	933	818	815
08043120022	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,139	7%	1,160	3,876	815

Table 6 cont'd.

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 2,201

Page 1

and Cost is less than 2,400

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
05009064026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Lel. Dis.	75	\$2,277	9%	467	1,825	217
46086001026	Supv.	yes	yes	Gde. Lel. Dis.	no	\$2,282	5%	785	1,716	217
22029087002	Psych.	no	no	screen	no	\$2,266	1%	94	786	309
49081041025	Cs. Mgr.	yes	yes	Grc. Lel.	85	\$2,273	5%	7,475	46,821	309
74047083026	Cous.	no	no	no	no	\$2,241	7%	1,181	4,875	312
24047308026	Prin.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl. Dis.	no	\$2,203	5%	3,988	3,021 a	312
41057007026	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,323	6%	4575	12,480 a	618
45079140026	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,274	8%	2,052	4,976	618
50082040026	Prin.	no	no	no	no	\$2,343	6%	873	2,568	618
50062116002	Supv.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	85	\$2,233	4%	329	41,560	618
35050122002	Psycho.	no	no	no		\$2,388	9%	638	10,347	815

File: PROJECT.ID

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 2,401

Page 1

and Cost is less than 2,600

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
10068012026	Prin.	no	no	no	no	\$2,557	6%	1,550	7,604	217
11023095025	Tch.	no	no	no	80	\$2,539	4%	2,005	9,885	217
38060123026	Supv.	No	no	Tch. refer	no	\$2,447	7%	574	2,719	217
17020017026	Prin.	yes	?		no	\$2,497	10%	850	2,252	309
48072150025	LD Coord	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl. Exp	75	\$2,599	5%	18,000	124,160	309
49081036002	LD Tch.	yes	yes		70	\$2,450	7%	257	5,931	309
31045301026	Psych.			NLE		\$2,583	6%	1,202	442	312
15051020026						\$2,417	3%	1,811	5,652	618
25041082002	Psycho.	yes			yes	\$2,460	3%	260	17,193	618
04101140004	Prin.	no	no		no	\$2,475	8%	639	2,313 a	815
24032001026	Psych.	yes	yes		85	\$2,559	6%	1,554	3,028	815
36052170022	Supv.	no	no		85	\$2,559	6%	3,266	15,710	815
52089203026	Psycho.	no	no		no	\$2,415	3%	555	598	815

Table 6 cont'd.

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 2,601
and Cost is less than 2,800

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
3204611025	Pycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	70	\$2,690	8%	3,480	30,166	815
37053425004	Pycho.	yes	no	Gde. Lvl.	80	\$2,711	11%	63		815

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 2,801
and Cost is less than 3,000

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
31045304026	Pycho.			NCE		\$2,926	6%	1,969	6,373	309
43059020013	Supv.	yes	yes	Std. Scr.	85	\$2,991	1%	288	2,740	309
20096225016	Tch.	no	no		no	\$2,952	5%	603	5,954	618
50082189022	Tch. & Su	yes	no		no	\$2,907	2%	18,706	55,200	618
44060019024	Pycho.	no	no	no	no	\$2,965	5%	450	786	815
44063140003	Pycho.			Regrs.	no	\$2,900	12%	450	4,361	815

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 3,001
and Cost is less than 3,200

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
09010193017	Prin.	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl. Exp	85	\$3,101	3%	1,004	20,161 a	217
17064003026	Prin.	yes	yes		no	\$3,166	2%	611	561 a	309
17064016026	Prin.	yes	yes	no	no	\$3,150	8%	2,195	720 a	309
14016026002	Pycho.	yes	yes	Achv. Lvl.	no	\$3,080	7%	1,269	52,634	312
12040001026						\$3,028	5%	1,947	3,186	618
45067003026	Pycho.	no	no		85	\$3,132	4%	510	896	618

Table 6 cont'd.

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 3,201
and Cost is less than 3,400

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
49081030017	Tch.	yes	yes	Ach. Lvl.	85	\$3,286	8%	207	20,907 a	309
02077101026	A"	no	no	no	no	\$3,227	4%	1,123	6,833	815

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 3,401
and Cost is less than 3,600

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
37053230017	Prin.	yes	yes		no	\$3,418	3%	291	4,416	815

File: PROJECT.ID

Page 1

Report: per capita

Selection: Cost is greater than 3,601

Dist. Code	Monitor	Entrance	Exit	Formula	IQ Cutoff	Cost	% LD	# Students	Town Size	Area Code
02002001022	Prin.	no	no		no	\$3,691	4%	1,300	1,578 a	309
14016086002	Soc. Wkr	yes	yes	no	85	\$3,711	5%	385	8,226 a	312
24032101016	Sde. Csl	no	no		no	\$5,727	3%	746	1,669	815
24047018016	Prin.	No	no	no	no	\$4,354	12%	145	798	815
35056230004	Pycho.	yes	yes	no	no	\$3,856	5%	93	18,166	815

that could be discerned. Generally, the districts seemed to rely on the guidance of the special education cooperatives. The criteria used by the cooperatives varied considerably, and it is conceivable that students who were classified in one district could move a few miles to another district and not meet the different classification criteria. On a subjective note, most superintendents indicated that they would welcome specific guidelines from the state provided that they would still be able to meet the unique needs of the students in their districts.

In the final analysis of the student variables and in an effort to address objectives 1 and 5, districts were first sorted by size (less than 200 students, between 200 and 500, between 500 and 1000, between 1000 and 2000, and greater than 2000), population (town less than 10000 population, between 10000 and 50000, between 50000 and 100000 other than Chicago or a Chicago suburb (312 area code), Chicago suburb, and the city of Chicago), and per capita tuition cost (less than \$2000, between \$2000 and \$2200, \$2200 and \$2400, \$2400 and \$2600, \$2600 and \$2800, \$2800 and \$3000, \$3000 and \$3200, \$3200 and \$3400, \$3400 and \$3600, and greater than \$3600). All student variables were then checked for significant differences using the sorted district variables by means of a chi-square.

When viewing the student variables as dependent and the size of the district as independent, the smallest districts (less than 200 students) retained the students in a grade less often than did the others (25% of the sample from the smallest districts versus

38% of the total sample) and had students who came from a single parent family less often (8% versus 25%). On the other hand, the largest districts (more than 2000 students) had fewer students receiving resource services (56% versus 65% overall) and more students served through self-contained programs (40% versus 30% overall). Additionally, these large districts had students who were classified as LD placed into lower level classes more often than did the rest of the districts (14% versus 9% overall). Finally, districts with student populations between 500 and 1000 had more students labeled as LD receiving Chapter 1 services than did the others (21% versus 11% overall). Incidentally, the lower level classes (which were received by 18% of the total sample in grades 7 through 12) and Chapter 1 services (which were received by 24% of the total sample in grades 1 through 6) were the only regular education remedial services that children identified as learning disabled received with any regularity.

When the districts were separated by their locations, the districts in large, independent cities (more than 100000 total population) and the Chicago suburbs retained students in a grade more often (63% and 52% respectively versus 38% overall) and had more students from single parent families (62% and 51% respectively versus 25% overall) than did the other districts. The districts in small towns (less than 10000 population) placed the students in resource services more often (73% versus an average of 46% for the other districts) and in self-contained programs less often (21% versus an average of 49%) than did the

others.

Lastly, when districts were separated by their per capita tuition charges, a number of differences were found, however, only two patterns presented themselves: (a) districts whose per capita tuition costs were more than \$3000 retained students in grades less often than did the districts whose expenses were less than this amount; and (b) those whose costs were more than \$2400 offered psychological and counseling services more often than did the others. The other differences that were noted included: (a) districts with per capita costs between \$2600 - \$2800 and \$3200 - \$3400 had more children from single parent families; (b) those with costs between \$2400 - \$2600 had more children who had been previously referred; (c) those with costs between \$2800 - \$3000 offered more social work services; (d) those with costs less than \$2200 and between \$3200 - \$3400 offered more Chapter 1 services; and (e) those with costs between \$3200 - \$3400 offered more lower level classes.

Teacher Variables

While teacher information was not directly linked to the five objectives delineated by the State Board of Education, we felt that it was important to develop an overall view of the professionals who direct the instructional programs for children labeled as learning disabled. Across the 67 districts, data were collected on a total of 457 teachers, however, as was the case with the student variables, not all information was available for all teachers. About 85% of the teachers were female. Of the 15%

who were male, there was no discernable variance across the categories of districts. The average teacher had at least 3 years of experience and held both elementary (Type 03) and special education (Type 10) certificates. Few of the teachers had preschool certification or certification as vocational coordinators. Interestingly, slightly over 1% of the teachers did not have special education certification of any kind.

The teaching experience of the teachers in the LD programs was well distributed across the 3 to 15-year range with few teachers with experience in LD programs for more than 15 years. Beginning teachers (0 - 2 years) were generally employed by districts with more than 2000 students total enrollment with only approximately 1% in districts with a student population of less than 200 total enrollment. The age of the teachers ranged from 25 to 60, with an even distribution across all age ranges. Approximately 40% of the teachers were from small towns or rural areas of the state where the per capita tuition cost was between \$2200 to \$2800.

When the programs are divided into resource, self-contained, or consultative, there are several interesting observations that could be drawn. Of the teachers teaching in 9 - 12 resource programs, 72% were working in large cities other than the Chicago suburbs. Approximately 43% of the teachers involved in self-contained programs were located in small cities with 10000 to 50000 population. While 5% (68) students across several settings were served through consultative programs, only 3 teachers of the

total of 457 identified themselves as a part of a consultative program.

Within these program types, each was identified as either categorical or cross-categorical. Of these two, cross-categorical placements were more frequently used than were the categorical placements (58% versus 42%). While cross-categorical placements had little variance in distribution across locations, 55% of the categorical arrangements were in rural or small town settings with 69% of these having student populations greater than 2000. These findings point to a need for the State Board of Education to reconsider its certification standards since districts are moving toward the cross-categorical option. Presently, the State certifies only on a categorical basis.

Summary of Results by Objective

Objective 1: to determine what regular education remedial services are available to students identified as learning disabled (LD) in conjunction with their special education services. In regard to this objective, the only general education services that were received by the students in the sample on a regular basis were Chapter 1 services and lower level classes. Speech therapy was the most often provided related special service. Other related services including social work, psychological or counseling services, and occupational or physical therapy were available but were not as frequently needed. The larger districts used the lower level classes more often than did the others, however, this is probably due to the fact that many of the smaller districts were elementary districts or did not feel a need to provide this type of service. The districts with student populations between 500 and 1000 offered more Chapter 1 services than did the others.

Objective 2: to determine how students identified as LD are selected to participate in the special education program. By far the most common reason for referral was academic difficulties (43.4%). The two next most common reasons were either an attention deficit (25.0%) or reading problems (15.1%). The most common assessment instruments used were the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised and the Wide Range Achievement Test. Most children were functioning below their age level in academic skills and the average IQ (90.4 on the WISC-R) was below the

population average of 100. The criteria used by districts to classify children as learning disabled varied widely. In conversations with superintendents and others in the districts, we were able to draw three subjective conclusions: (a) that they would generally welcome specific guidelines for classification provided that these guidelines still retained enough latitude to allow individual districts to meet their unique needs; (b) that general education teachers need to take more responsibility for children who are experiencing academic difficulties in their classes; and (c) that all superintendents and their staffs are professional educators who care about providing the best possible services to children first and are less concerned about the specific labels than with the child's demonstrated abilities and progress.

Objective 3: to determine the percentage of time per day the students identified as LD receive special services. The majority (65.5%) were served through resource programs where they spent an average of 5 hours 52 minutes per week (19.5% of their time based on a school week of 30 hours). The students who were served through self-contained programs (29.4% of the sample) spent an average of 24.6% of their time (7 hours 23 minutes per week) in regular education. Finally, the students who were served through consultative programs (5.1%) received their special education teachers' services an average of 65 minutes per week either as teacher to teacher consulting or as irregular support to the student when the student or a teacher felt it was necessary.

Objective 4: to determine what special areas of need tend to be emphasized in programs for students identified as LD. The goals established for the children in the sample were primarily academic in nature with reading (36.3%), mathematics (29.1%), and language (23.1%) accounting for 88.5% of the total goals. Interestingly, perceptual remediation, a classical descriptor of learning disabilities, accounted for only 0.2% of the total goals.

Objective 5: to determine if there are demographic or other variables associated with the identification process related to students labeled learning disabled on a statewide, regional, and local basis. There was no discernable pattern in the procedures used by districts to classify children as learning disabled. The larger districts tended to be slightly more likely to retain students in grades and to use more self-contained services that did the smaller ones. These results, though, are not at all surprising when one considers that the larger districts have more students and could justify self-contained services on numbers of students and could more easily accommodate the class size changes that would result from retentions. Other differences have been noted earlier, yet, while these differences are interesting, no one or two specific factors that affected the classification of students seemed to surface. All of the districts had thought through their classification processes, all adhered to state and federal guidelines, and all were attempting to meet the specific needs of the children in their districts. Most would welcome specific state guidelines provided that these guidelines would

allow the districts to modify or adapt the guidelines to meet their own unique needs. Since Illinois has a wide variety of districts based on needs, student populations, financial support and other demographic variables, any guidelines established would have to be the result of a statewide panel with representation from all areas and types of districts. To establish guidelines without this input would only result in many districts who would not have their needs addressed.

Discussion

A possible limitation of this study is the fact that data were not available for all students. However, it is still felt that the sample was representative of the population of students who are classified as learning disabled in Illinois. The 67 randomly selected districts represented all areas of Illinois with the exception of the city of Chicago public schools. This area, with its exceptionally large population, needs separate study.

The most general conclusion that can be reached is that the methods districts use to classify children as learning disabled are as diverse as the state itself. Some districts had adopted or were in the process of adopting discrepancy formulae to assist them in the classification process. Other districts were not even considering this as an option. On the whole, districts tended to classify children as learning disabled if the children were slightly lower than average in intellectual capabilities and were experiencing academic difficulties. Many superintendents felt that while these children may not have met classical definitions of learning disabilities, they did need extra, individualized attention and service through the LD program was the only way that these needs could be met and funded. Appropriate means of providing monetary and instructional aid to these students who might "fall through the cracks" is an additional issue that the state needs to study. These findings point to the need for the state to take some action in the field to help bring some consistency to the classification and service provision process.

As we view the results, we see basically three courses of action from which the state may choose. First, the state may wish to adopt the philosophy of Kavale and Forness (1985) and express the opinion that the field of learning disabilities is really in a preparadigmatic period and that all theories and definitions have a place and deserve experimentation. Through experimentation, one theory would eventually come to the forefront and present itself for adoption. Such a philosophy would essentially maintain the status quo in Illinois since districts are currently operating under a variety of theories. However, in order to allow for one theory to advance, the state would need to require a standardized series of data collection efforts for each district that would document the relative effectiveness of each classification scheme and service provision option. Such data would then have to be evaluated in a type of meta-analysis. Adoption of this course of action would require that the state name a representative panel to oversee all data collection and analysis procedures. To develop one standard classification scheme through this process would take a number of years, but it would allow for all theories to have a fair test.

A second option that the state might choose would be to adopt its own, more narrow and better-defined classification criteria (e.g., discrepancy formulae). However, while most superintendents did not oppose such an action, most also felt that this was a step for the state to take carefully. Considerations must be given to the diversity of needs that exist among the many districts of

Illinois. Some districts could easily accommodate the changes that an administrative edict would dictate, while for others, severe problems in service provision would result. Should the state choose this option, we would recommend that it carefully study the impact on children that any new criteria would have and again, that it form a representative, statewide panel to develop the criteria.

The third option open to the state would be a radical departure from traditional thinking in the field of learning disabilities. In this option, services could be provided to children based solely on their demonstrated needs rather than on any arbitrary classifications. For example, if a child needed extra help in reading, then this help would be provided whether or not the child met any particular classification criteria. Funding, rather than being based on labels, would instead be based on services provided. From an idealistic view, this option appears to us to be the most palatable. By trusting the professional judgment and expertise of the educators who are directly involved with the children and allowing the discretionary use of funds, the state would be able to address the diverse needs that are present. Of course, the chance for abuse of funds would exist, however this chance could be lowered by requiring the districts to document all services that they provide and the progress made by each child. This option, while finally eliminating the labeling dilemma, would be politically difficult to implement and would require, as would any of the other options,

that the state form a representative panel whose charge would be to monitor the effects that such a radical departure would have on the children.

Whether the State of Illinois chooses one of these three options that we have suggested, or whether it chooses a totally different course of action, it is to be congratulated for its methodical plan in studying this subject. The conduct of this study, whose purpose it was to delineate the characteristics of the present population of students classified as learning disabled, was a necessary first step in an attempt to address a difficult topic. The second step is to seek various points of view and to adopt a mutually agreeable plan of action. After implementation of this plan, continued study would be necessary in order to monitor its effectiveness. We hope that our contribution to this total effort assists the state as it attempts to provide the best educational services to the children of Illinois.

References

- Berdine, W. H. & Blackhurst, A. E. (1985). An introduction to special education, Second edition. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Boyan, C. (1985). California's new eligibility criteria: Legal and program implications. Exceptional Children, 52, 131-141.
- Bryan, T. H. & Bryan, H. J. (1978). Understanding learning disabilities, Second edition. Sherman Oaks, CA: Alfred Publishing Company.
- Federal Register. Washington, DC: Monday, 29 November, 1976.
- Kavale, K. A., & Forness, S. R. (1985). Learning disability and the history of science: Paradigm or paradox. Remedial and Special Education, 6 (4), 12-24.
- Lehtinen, L. (1955). Appendix. In Psychopathology and education of the brain-injured child. Vol. 2, Progress in theory and clinic. A. A. Strauss and N. C. Kephart (Eds.). New York: Grune & Stratton.
- Lerner, J. (1981). Learning disabilities. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Reynolds, C. R. (1985). Measuring the aptitude-achievement discrepancy in learning disability diagnosis. Remedial and Special Education, 6 (5), 37-48.
- Sutaria, S.D. (1985). Specific learning disabilities: Nature and needs. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Tucker, J. (1981). Ethnic proportions in classes for the learning disabled: Issues in nonbiased assessment. Journal of Special Education, 14, 93-105.

U. S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. (1982). Sixth annual report to Congress on the implementation of Public Law 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., & Epps, S. (1983). A logical and empirical analysis of current practice in classifying students as handicapped. Exceptional Children, 50, 160-166.

APPENDIX 1

STUDENT CHECKLIST
Attachment A

The following information shall be collected from the student educational records and/or from staff interviews for each student in the sample. All information should be recorded on this form unless data are not available from either source. A separate checklist must be filled out for each student in the sample.

PART I - STUDENT VARIABLES

1. STUDENT CODE

2. GRADE

3. ☐ Yes ☐ No Medication
4. ☐ Yes ☐ No Retained in Grade
5. ☐ Yes ☐ No Single Parent
6. ☐ Yes ☐ No Previously Referred
7. ☐ Yes ☐ No Non-English Speaking

8. RELATED SERVICES AS RECORDED ON THE IEP
(Check those that apply.)

- ☐ Speech
☐ Psychology
☐ Social Work
☐ OT/PT
☐ Other

9. INTELLECTUAL ASSESSMENT

WECHSLER

V P FS

GINET

I.Q. M.A.

K-ABC

Sim. Seq. MPC

SLOSSON

I.Q.

OTHER

Name I.Q.

10. ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT

	PERCENTILE	STANDARD SCORE	TEST ADMINISTERED
Reading Recognition			
Reading Comprehension			
Math Computation			
Math Application			
Spelling			

11. ☐ Yes ☐ No Resource Student
If yes, respond to the following:

Number of days per week student receives services

- ☐ 1 - 2 days
☐ 3 - 4 days
☐ 5 days

Minutes per day spent in resource program

- ☐ 0 - 60 minutes
☐ 61 - 90 minutes
☐ 91 - 120 minutes
☐ More than 120 minutes

12. ☐ Yes ☐ No Self-contained Student

If yes, minutes per day spent in regular education

- ☐ 0 - 60 minutes
☐ 61 - 90 minutes
☐ 91 - 120 minutes
☐ More than 120 minutes

13. ☐ Yes ☐ No Consultation Student

If yes, number of minutes per week the teacher spends consulting with the regular education teachers

- ☐ 0 - 30 minutes
☐ 31 - 60 minutes
☐ More than 60 minutes

14. REGULAR EDUCATION SPECIAL SERVICES

	I. SERVICES STUDENT IS RECEIVING (✓)	II. SERVICES AVAILABLE TO DISTRICT (✓)
Chapter I		
Reading/Math Clinic		
University		
Lower Level Classes		
Bilingual		
Other:		

15. ANNUAL GOALS

	I. PRIMARY REASON FOR REFERRAL (Check one)	II. ANNUAL GOALS LISTED ON STUDENT'S IEP
Reading Recognition		
Reading Comprehension		
Math Calculation		
Math Computation		
Written Language		
Recep Language		
Expressive Language		
Behavior		
Other:		

PART. II - CLASSROOM VARIABLES**1. CLASS SIZE****2. STUDENT/TEACHER RATIO**3. ☐ Yes ☐ No Aide4. ☐ Yes ☐ No Are other support personnel available to the classroom? If yes, identify.5. ☐ Yes ☐ No Noncategorical
If yes, check one.

- ☐ LD/BD
- ☐ LD/EMH
- ☐ LD/EH
- ☐ Other

6. Number of non-English speaking students

- ☐ 0 - 5
- ☐ 6 - 10
- ☐ More than 10

7. ☐ Yes ☐ No Has a deviation been approved for the classroom? If yes, check one.

- ☐ Class size
- ☐ Age range
- ☐ Both

8. ☐ Yes ☐ No Does the student remain in his/her building for the LD program?

9. By whom is the student's progress monitored after placement in the program? Check one.

- ☐ Psychologist
- ☐ Social Worker
- ☐ Supervisor
- ☐ Other

10. ☐ Yes ☐ No Does the district have specific entrance criteria?☐ Yes ☐ No Exit criteria?☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, do they utilize a discrepancy formula?

- ☐ Grade Level Discrepancy
- ☐ Achievement Level Expectancy
- ☐ Standard Score Discrepancy
- ☐ Regression Model
- ☐ Other

Describe:

11. ☐ Yes ☐ No Does the district have an I.Q. cut-off for placement of students in the LD program? If yes, check one.

- ☐ 75
- ☐ 80
- ☐ 85
- ☐ 90
- ☐ 95
- ☐ 100

PROJECT I.D.
STUDENT CHECKLIST DEFINITIONS

Item 1: Student Code: Use the code provided by district or ISBE

Item 2: Grade: Grade in which student was enrolled during AY 1984-1985

Item 3: Medication: Did the student take any medication while enrolled in the program?

Item 4: Retained in Grade: Has the student ever been retained in any grade?

Item 5: Single Parent: If the student is living with both parents (either biological or step), check NO. If the student is living in any situation other than an intact family, (e.g., foster home or just one parent) check YES.

Item 6: Previously Referred: If the student had ever been referred (but not placed) for LD services prior to the placement in his/her current program, check YES.

Item 7: Non-English Speaking: If the student's primary language is anything other than English, check YES.

Item 8: Check any related services that apply. Use the following code to note other related services:

- A - Adapted Physical Education
- C - Aide - Individual Student
- D - Art Therapy
- E - Audiology
- F - Brailist/Reader
- G - Counseling Services
- H - Consultant Services (other than Consultation Students)
- I - Adapted Driver Education (Student must be at least 15)
- J - Interpreter Services
- K - Media Services
- L - Music Therapy
- N - Outdoor Education
- O - Orientation and Mobility
- Q - Parent Counseling
- T - Psychiatric Services
- U - Recreation
- V - School Health Services
- Y - Transportation (Special)
- 2 - Vocational Habilitation/Rehabilitation (operated cooperatively by the district and the Department of Rehabilitation Services)
- 3 - Transition Services (other than those provided cooperatively with the Department of Rehabilitation Services)

Item 9: Intellectual Assessment: Record the scores used to determine placement. If SOMPA was used, record both the WISC

scores and the adjusted WISC scores.

Item 10: Academic Assessment: Record the data used for placement (part of the student's case study). Do not record group achievement test scores or teacher-made assessments unless these scores were used to determine placement.

Item 11: Resource Student: A student is to be classified as a resource student if he/she receives less than 50% of his/her programming through the LD program. In addition to the data requested, also calculate the minutes per week the student receives LD resource services and circle.

Item 12: Self-Contained Student: A student is to be classified as a self-contained student if he/she receives more than 50% of his/her instructional programming through the LD program. Also, calculate the minutes per week the student receives self-contained LD services and circle.

Item 13: Consultation Student: A student is to be classified as a consultation student if he/she has been identified as LD but receives no direct services from the LD program.

Item 14: Regular Education Special Services: Please check both the services that are available to the district and the services that the student is receiving. Chapter 1, Reading/Math Clinic and Bilingual services are self-explanatory. University services are any special services provided through a university or by university students (e.g., special tutoring services). Lower level classes refer to the tracking classes offered by some districts.

Item 15: Annual Goals: Check one primary reason for the student's referral for LD services and check all areas that are listed as annual goals on the student's IEP. Most areas are self-explanatory with the exception of Math Calculation. For the purposes of this study, Math Calculation is to be equated with Math Application.

PROJECT I.D.
CLASSROOM VARIABLES DEFINITIONS

Item 1: Class Size: Number of students enrolled in the student's class, resource, or consultation program.

Item 2: Student/Teacher Ratio: Ratio for the student's class, resource, or consultation program.

Item 3: Aide: Did an aide serve the student's class, resource, or consultation program?

Item 4: Other Support Personnel: Did any other support personnel serve the student's class, resource, or consultation program?

Item 5: Noncategorical: For the purposes of this study, noncategorical is to be equated with cross categorical.

Item 6: Number of Non-English Speaking Students: Number of students in the student's class, resource, or consultation program whose primary language is not English.

Item 7: Deviations: Self-explanatory

Item 8: In Building: Self-explanatory

Item 9: Progress Monitoring: Who (other than the student's teacher) monitors his/her program?

Item 10: Criteria: If the answer to any of the parts of this question is no, question the individual supplying the information as to how placement decisions are made and record their responses in the space provided.

Item 11: Self-explanatory

PROJECT ID
Department of Special Education
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, Illinois 61920

SCHOOL DISTRICT CODE

TEACHER/SITE CHECKLIST

PART I - TEACHER VARIABLES

1. TEACHER CODE

2. PROGRAM TYPE

- ☐ Resource Grade Range _____
☐ Self-Contained Grade Range _____
☐ Consultation Grade Range _____

3. CLASS TYPE

- ☐ Yes ☐ No Categorical
☐ Yes ☐ No Cross-Categorical
 If yes, check one.

- ☐ LD/BD
☐ LD/EMH
☐ LD/EH
☐ Other _____

- ☐ Male ☐ Female

GRADES TAUGHT:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Preschool | <input type="checkbox"/> Seventh |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Kindergarten | <input type="checkbox"/> Eighth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> First | <input type="checkbox"/> Ninth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Second | <input type="checkbox"/> Tenth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Third | <input type="checkbox"/> Eleventh |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fourth | <input type="checkbox"/> Twelfth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fifth | <input type="checkbox"/> Vocational Training |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sixth | |

HIGHER EDUCATION

- ☐ Bachelor Degree
☐ Masters Degree
☐ Advanced Certificate
☐ Doctorate

CERTIFICATE (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Preschool
☐ Elementary
☐ Secondary area(s) _____
☐ Special education area(s) _____
☐ Vocational Coordinator

YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE

- | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| LD: <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 | TOTAL: <input type="checkbox"/> 0-2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3-5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3-5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6-8 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 9-15 | <input type="checkbox"/> 9-15 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 16+ | <input type="checkbox"/> 16+ |

AGE

- ☐ 21-25
☐ 26-30
☐ 31-35
☐ 36-45
☐ 46-55
☐ 56-60
☐ 61-65
☐ 66-70

PART II - DISTRICT VARIABLES

1. DISTRICT CODE

2. LOCATION OF DISTRICT

- ☐ City of Chicago
☐ Chicago Suburb
☐ Large city other than Chicago
or suburban (over 100,000)
☐ Mid-sized city (50,000-100,000)
☐ Small city (10,000-50,000)
☐ Rural (0-10,000)

3. PER STUDENT COST, 1984

4. NUMBER OF STUDENTS

5. NUMBER OF STUDENTS CLASSIFIED AS PRIMARY LD,
1984-85